

**Purchase Rate of Sugarcane by the  
Ugar Sugar Factory, Belgaum.**

**Q.—1546.** Sri V. L. PATIL  
(Raibag).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) whether it is a fact that Ugar Sugar Factory in Belgaum district made an agreement with Bombay Government to purchase sugarcane for Rs. 45 per ton for three years;

(b) whether they are aware that the Factory paid two years and not paid third year at the agreed rate;

(c) whether it is a fact that the Central Government asked the factory to pay at the rate of Rs. 45 according to the contract made with the Government;

(d) if so, the reasons for not insisting upon the Factory to pay Rs. 45 per ton as per the contract;

(e) whether they have received any representations from the sugarcane growers to ask the said Factory to pay the agreed price for the year 1956-57?

**A.—Sri H. S. RUDRAPPA** (Minister for Agriculture).—

(a) So far as this Government are aware, it was mutually agreed between the Government of Bombay and the Deccan Sugar Factories Association, of which the Sugar Works Ltd., is a member to pay a price of Rs. 45 per ton of sugarcane for the season 1956-57.

(b) According to information available with Government, the Factory did not at first pay the price of Rs. 45 for the season 1956-57.

(c) Yes.

(d) The factory has since paid the price of Rs. 45 per ton for the cane in respect of which agreement was entered into prior to 1st November 1956, i.e., prior to re-organisation of States, on which date the agreement ceases to operate. From 1st November 1956 the price linking formula for 1956-57 will be applicable and the Factory would be liable to pay an additional price under this formula.

(e) Yes.

**BUDGET FOR 1958-59—GENERAL  
DISCUSSION.**

**(Debate continued.)**

**Sri B. BASAVALINGAPPA** (Bangalore South—S.C.).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very happy that the Hon'ble Minister for Finance has presented a surplus Budget. I feel a surplus Budget will lead us to mental satisfaction. Sri Mohamed Imam is here. He knows when the Central Budget was presented in Parliament it was received with dull response. As a person who is interested in the developmental activities of the State, I feel that I also have the responsibility for this Budget. The Finance Minister has stated that we must cut the coat according to the cloth. But this is not a happy note to the people who are prepared to make utmost sacrifices and also engage themselves in complete activity in the path of progress of the country.

**Sri U. M. MADAPPA** (Chamarajnagar).—On a point of order, Sir. According to the list of business, certain Bills have to be introduced.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—I have been responsible to postpone it.

**Sri B. BASAVALINGAPPA.**—Sir, when I went through the Budget, I did not find any increased provision for the developmental schemes and to implement the Five-Year Plan to meet the needs of the people. I wish that hereafter at least the Finance Minister—I am very sorry he is not here—will present a Budget with increased provision for developmental activities of the State. Last time when I spoke on the Budget I had made certain remarks about the preparation of the Budget and I am happy to say that those remarks have been met with success since certain alterations, regarding revised figures, have been introduced. The Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee which ought to have met last year have not met and as a result we find that certain irregularities which would have been observed by these committees are not before us. The Audit Report and the Accounts for the year 1956-57 covering the period from 1st April to 30th October 1956 have been